



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

COMMENTS.

MR. EDITOR: The Rev. Dr. Shedd's article on Endless Punishment, in the February number of the REVIEW, is so skillful a bit of dialectics, so accurate and clever in much of its reasoning, and at the same time so full of unconscious self-portraiture, that I can quite understand your determination to risk the publication of such a paper in pages noteworthy otherwise for their catholicity. The reverend gentleman handles his brief well, and if he fails to convince me that everlasting damnation is a cheerful creed, quite reconcilable with human ideas of the goodness of God, it is not from any want of talent as, literally, a devil's advocate. At the same time, I think he has a very bad case — unless, as I suspect, he is a sly humorist, and really means, in his dry way, to express sympathy for the other side. I am reminded of a famous dictum of Frederick the Great, uttered when this very question was fluttering the ecclesiastical dove-cotes. "Let those who believe in eternal damnation," he said, "be eternally damned, as they hope and believe; but, in the mean time, let them leave other more charitable people alone." I quite agree with Dr. Shedd, that God is Eternal Justice; but on what possible ground does our finite reason presume to fathom the ways in which that Eternal Justice is to work? How is the Conditioned to postulate the conduct of the Unconditioned, to show where finite sin ends and infinite retribution begins? It seems to many of us that the great saving strength of Christianity is its power to explain away the very Nemesis that Dr. Shedd vaunts so boldly, to extend indefinitely the area of human efforts toward regeneration, and to show that, however harshly man's judgment may deal with social and moral offenses, the judgment of God is something so very different that it points out avenues of escape to even the worst of sinners. Certain sins, according to Dr. Shedd, must be infinite in their consequences, and one of these is the sin of taking away human life — videlicet, murder. But surely there is here a very manifest contradiction. The sin of murder, from the Christian point of view, is in reality a finite sin; it does not destroy the life eternal, but only shortens the finite life; for, though Abel is slain, the soul of Abel lives imperishable. How, then, exact an eternal penalty from Cain for what was, after all, only a finite offense? Yes, cries Dr. Shedd, but Eternal Justice has to be satisfied! Eternal Justice? Is Dr. Shedd to determine where that begins and ends, or how it works? Why, it is as much as saying that God cannot save Cain, because finite human intelligence weighs and appraises the quality of his justice, or mercy! The reverend doctor argues very cleverly that punishment is retributive, not reforma-

tory; a point that has previously been taken by Sir James Stephen, in his writings on criminal jurisprudence. Here again, however, the difficulty arises, that judicial punishment, though retributive and absolute in form, is essentially founded on human conceptions of ethics. A judge is, for expedience' sake, the representative of Law Absolute; in reality, however, he is merely the administrator of local ideas of right and wrong. His work begins and ends with the exactment of a certain penalty; he never presumes to follow the criminal *ad infinitum* with the consequences of deeds for which he has legally atoned. Unless Dr. Shedd can show us, what no eye has yet seen and no mind yet conceived, the entire code of a Divine Jurisprudence, and thus convince us that he, a creature, can understand the Law Absolute, he has, in his zeal to damn some of his unfortunate brethren, left himself on the horns of a dilemma. The famous *bon mot*, that God having in the beginning created man in his image, man has ever since been returning the compliment, is sadly illustrated in the case of Dr. Shedd. The God of his imagining is, to my thinking, something monstrous beyond measure, and to talk of eternal mercy in such a connection is, I feel, little short of blasphemy. The wrath of the Lord may be likened to a sword, but never to an instrument of endless torture. But I am quite certain that Dr. Shedd does not realize the full extent of his argument, that he is the victim of his own solitary blunder in logic. He has tried to define the indefinable, to postulate what is inconceivable; and, in so doing, he has invested the Divine Father with the attributes of a human Rhadamanthus. The conception of an All-Powerful and All-Beneficent Being, who bases his Eternal Law on the moral destruction and consequent damnation of any living creature, is out of all harmony with the Christian idea of a Redeemer—one who came not to lead the righteous, but sinners, to repentance. All Dr. Shedd's cleverness will not free him from the folly of having taken a brief for the devil, and thrown discredit on the tenderest and deepest intuitions of human nature.

WALTER S. PALMER.

MR. EDITOR: Mr. Murat Halstead, in the rôle of resurrectionist of sectionalism, is a harmless being, and but for his grim aspect of earnestness would be almost diverting. But a wild-eyed and grimy grave-digger cannot be quite comic. As a "presumptionist," so to speak, Mr. Halstead is really amusing. In the REVIEW for March, he remarks: "It is a safe presumption that the Independent Republican diversion of the campaign closed in November will not be repeated." This is, in fact, a very unsafe presumption for the revivalists of sectionalism. It may be that the Republican party will never again dare to nominate for the highest office in this Republic a man who throughout a long political career has used his influence and the power intrusted to him for the service of the public to make sordid gain for himself; who, though fiery in debate and bold in denial of fact and allegation of falsehood, has been quick enough

"To crook the pregnant hinges of the knee
Where thrift may follow fawning";

a man who could be supported by half the press of his party only by a general somersault of able editors. But should it repeat that daring experi-

ment, there would unquestionably be another diversion, fully as independent and perhaps less diverting for the elastic editors than the last. One other thing would be pretty sure to produce an independent diversion; and that is, the success of those crazy counselors of the Republican party who wish to get it to hold a grand camp-meeting in 1888 for the revival of sectionalism. There is a kind of men whom Mr. Murat Halstead cannot understand, to whom conscience is more than party, and honesty higher than success. They have a normal vision, and cannot be frightened from their equanimity by the "bugs and goblins" conjured up in a brain inflamed with party spirit. It may seem strange to Mr. Murat Halstead that they can "keep the natural ruby" of their cheeks when his are "blanched with fear," but they do not "behold such sights" as shake his disposition. It is the sheet-anchor of our national safety that there are men enough in the country with fidelity to conscience to hold the balance between parties and turn the scale against that which threatens at any moment to sacrifice the public weal for some selfish or corrupt end.

A. K. FISKE.

MR. EDITOR: Mr. Frederic Harrison's comment in the January REVIEW on Froude's revelation of Carlyle is a capital essay. Mr. Harrison's command of language is the despair of literary beginners. From the "well of English undefiled," in which he dips his pen, brilliant words and polished sentences gush up as profusely as the grains of sand in Heber's sunny fountains. One is dazzled by the display, if indeed he be not in danger of being blinded by it. The point of the criticism is this: That Carlyle, by exaggerating the facts, and Froude, by skillfully manipulating the records, have contrived between them to give an utterly false and inartistic view of the great man's life and character. Carlyle was not less happily situated (so Mr. Harrison holds) than a majority of the greatest writers in earlier and later times have been. In bodily state and surroundings, he was fortunate by comparison with many men of genius who have growled and grunted less. But, by an unlucky trick of speech, and the too artful aid of a literary disciple, he succeeded in persuading first himself and then his fellow-mortals that he was, without exception, the unhappiest creature ever born into a miserable world. As the whole trouble lay in his habit of exaggeration, Mr. Harrison naturally exclaims, "Let us not exaggerate." So, having said that Carlyle "lived and worked in poverty, in most honorable poverty," he adds (to avoid the appearance of exaggeration) that he was "surfeited with all that wealth could offer him." Again, having begun his article with an allusion to Carlyle as "the greatest master of English prose within our generation," he hastens to qualify this estimate by the statement that "the finest Carlylese is never equal to fine English." Thus, by exaggerating both ways, he seeks to avoid the error into which Carlyle and his biographer have fallen. Undoubtedly Carlyle did exaggerate, and it is not to be supposed that Mr. Froude attempted to soften the lights and shadows in the autobiographical picture that his master drew. But there can be no doubt—there is none in my mind, at least—that the portrait of Carlyle painted by himself in the volumes Mr. Froude has edited is as true to life as the portraits therein drawn of his contemporaries are false. It is not an attractive likeness; but there are noble features in it, that stand out in high relief from the murky background.

Mr. Harrison questions that Carlyle had the right "to fling into the street the inner sanctities of his heart," or that it could have been the duty of a friend to abet him in such an undertaking. By such revelations, if not of married misery, yet certainly of something very different from wedded happiness, "a moral wound is inflicted upon the conscience of men." They are not edifying, it is true. But what really wounds the conscience and debases the moral tone of English readers to-day, is not such books as Mr. Froude's Carlyle, which serve a serious if unpleasant purpose; it is the social tittle-tattle, the cheap cynicism, the affectation, vulgarity, and insidious immorality of the so-called society journals. Let Mr. Harrison direct his brilliant rhetoric against this evil, and he will find it impossible to err in the direction of exaggeration.

JOSEPH B. GILDER.

MR. EDITOR: In Mr. Halstead's admirable article in the March number of the REVIEW there is, it seems to me, one important error. He calculates on the return to the Republican ranks, before 1888, of those who acted with the Democrats in the recent Presidential election. But this is not the teaching of experience. Did the Federalists that went over to the Democracy during Madison's Administration ever go back? Did a single one of the Free Soilers that left the Democratic party in 1848, and later, return to it? The Know-nothings were mainly from the Whig or Republican party; but when their organization went to pieces, they mostly (so far as we can trace them) became Democrats. And the war Democrats, who acted with the Republicans during the Rebellion, nearly all continued the alliance after the war was ended. Furthermore, in those historic instances nobody doubted that the seceders gave their true reason. These facts indicate a rule for which there are several explanations. One is to be found in the workings of popular imagination — or the lack of it. Standing long aloof from an organization or a set of men whom he looks upon as opponents, one attributes to them more evil qualities than they possess; and when some truce or other incident has thrown him among them, he awakes to the consciousness that these are men like unto himself, not so very bad after all, and in the delight of the new brotherhood he is liable to forget even the most important differences of faith and principle. Another is, that no man likes to have the reputation of a shuttlecock, and the very fact of having changed sides once becomes a powerful reason for not changing again. Among those Republicans who voted against their party last autumn, there are unquestionably some strong men who will prove superior to such tendencies, and will promptly return to it; but the large majority of them are practically Democrats henceforth. There are two sources from which the Republican party may now look for recruits. The first, of course, is the body of young men that will come of age before the next election. The other is more important. During the twenty-four years of Republican administration, all those honest, unassuming, but not altogether practical men, who look for perfection and can never see anything but defects, who imagine that a change might somehow or other bring in the political millennium, have been acting against the dominant party. They will now have, for the first time in the lives of many of them, an opportunity to see how infinitely worse a Democratic Administration can be, and will go over in a body to the Republicans. I do not say they

will be numerous enough to carry victory ; but that they will have abundant reason for going over, is no flippant assumption. All expectations of reform under the incoming Administration are childish. No reformation ever results from any movement, however honest at the outset, if in its eagerness for the means of success it parallels all the objectionable features of that which it promises to reform. Of course, every good citizen hopes that our new President will rise superior to the power that created him such ; and he may do so, if he is braver than the intrepid Pierce, more diplomatic than the veteran diplomatist Buchanan, more of a Christian gentleman than Polk ; all of whom were the choice of the South,—solid then as now,—and were by consequence its most obedient servants.

ROSSITER JOHNSON.

MR. EDITOR: In the symposium on "How Shall the President be Elected?" all the writers agree that the fathers of the Republic missed their aim in trying to provide that the people should vote for Electors, and that these latter should use their own judgment in voting for President. They ignore the question whether the aim itself was wise, or assume it to have been unwise ; and hence they suggest no means by which, if wise, it may now be attained. I hold the aim itself to have been wise, and that, instead of abolishing the Electoral College, it is better to make the slight change necessary to give it its proper working action, viz., to provide that instead of the Presidential Electors meeting at their State capitals, they shall meet in one body, voting still by ballot, at the national capital. This would transfer the responsibility to the Electors personally, and doubtless would subject them to the possibility of bribery. But bribery of a constitutional Elector can be made a crime, while bribery in our existing national conventions cannot be made a crime. Thus, to bring the operation of the Constitution into harmony with its intent, would supersede our State and national conventions so far as they are designed to bear on the choice of President, because all men would know that a National Electoral College meeting in one body would make its own nominations, as the College of Cardinals does in electing a Pope, and as our State legislatures do in electing a United States Senator. The degree in which our State legislatures are bogged and botched as legislatures, and hindered in their proper work, by making them an electoral body, even for choosing a United States Senator, should cure all men of the desire that they choose the Electors or the President, or even that Congress should choose the President. To make a legislature an electoral body, spoils it as a legislature, and does not arrive at a good electoral body. What some of your writers call the "distrust of the people" felt by the fathers was an actual foresight of two facts that all men will acknowledge to be true, viz. : that in a great country no man can be intelligently, personally known except to a few hundred or a few thousand persons. Millions may know his features accurately through portraits, or falsely through cartoons ; but they cannot know his qualities. Nor are more than a few thousand persons likely to have a very intelligent judgment as to the fitness of a man for President. For no man who is not himself fit for an office will judge very intelligently whether another is fit for it. The fact that he is not himself fit for it precludes his judging well of another's fitness. Mr. Purcell says that campaign biographies and the newspapers inform every voter fully as to the

candidate's qualities. Does he call the flingings of the campaign smut-mill a source of information? Mr. Purcell also calls the work of the nominating conventions, from primaries up to nationals, the choice of "the people." Pray when did these self-seeking political brokers and their tools, who alone take part in primaries, become "the people?" Was a man ever known to attend a primary or a convention who did not want an office? And did as many as one-tenth of the people ever take part in these unconstitutional primaries, which assume to make the choice for the whole? As well call the selection of the Divine Ox by the Egyptian priests a choice by the people. The campaign biographies and newspaper adulation are no more instructive to a voter than the floral garlands with which the priests bedeck the ox are useful to enable the boatman on the Nile to judge whether the Sun-God has really descended into the beef. All men that have first known a man's reputation, and then known him personally, know of how little value the opinions of men are concerning a man they do not personally know. Of the ten million votes cast for Blaine or Cleveland, all but those who knew both men personally, and knew the office of President well, were ignorant votes, *pro hac vice*, though cast by men that speak twenty languages. The fathers desired intelligent voting, without letting loose the floods of defamation or of adulation. On their plan, no one need vote for a man he did not know, or for an office concerning whose duties he could form no correct judgment. Voters would know the Elector in their own Congressional district; and the Electors, three or four hundred in number, would all know, without glamor or mask, the men for whom they voted. A National Electoral College would, if it met in one body, decide upon the election and qualifications of its members, and thus fill up every hiatus in the existing system that Mr. Dawes points out.

VAN BUREN DENSLOW.

MR. EDITOR: I congratulate you on your symposium on that barren fig-tree in our national vineyard, the Electoral College. But how many words are wasted by your able writers before they can tell you what they think! If the Electoral College is needless, then it is a nuisance, and therefore it ought to be abated. Our history demonstrates that political corruption exists in exactly inverse proportion to the extent of the constituency; that it is easier to bribe or overawe or overreach any one class than all classes; that the only effective policy to secure pure government is to make all the great offices elective by a secret vote of all the people; and that the old notion of the Federalists that we should seek to "clarify the popular will by successive filtrations," was false in theory and has been pernicious in practice. Plans to secure a true record of the popular vote deserve the study of every enlightened patriot. Whether complex or simple, all political machinery has two aims only: to get twelve honest men into the jury-box, and to get an honest count of the votes in the ballot-box. Chicago has just devised a plan that would seem to render election frauds impossible in communities that can defend their rights. It was the result of a conference between the Iroquois Club (a Democratic organization) and the Union League Club (a Republican organization) on the last day of last year. It provides for the selection or election of responsible and trustworthy judges and clerks, of both parties, or of all parties, when there are more than two contestants.

These officers shall be compelled by law to serve at the polling-places. No election precinct shall have more than three hundred voters, so that every voter may be known and his right to vote be investigated. No citizen shall be allowed to vote unless he shall have registered, and a legal investigation must precede registration. This inquest shall be made by the clerks officially, accompanied by authorized representatives of the political parties. To insure faithful service by intelligent men, all elective officers are to be regarded as officers of the county courts, and subject thereby to legal punishment for contempt of court in case of dereliction of duty. The scheme of law provides, furthermore, that returns in triplicate and tallies in duplicate shall be made, officially, to all the officers of election, and that the polls shall be promptly closed at four o'clock in the afternoon, so as to insure the publication of the result at an early hour. Other practical provisions are made to secure purity and fidelity. The plan has been elaborated into a bill covering fifty-five solid pages, and a joint committee has been appointed to revise and perfect it, and to urge its enactment by the Legislature. This is genuine political reform, and it should be reproduced and championed in other States. For, with an honest count, and not otherwise, every wise reform can be speedily accomplished.

JAMES REDPATH.

MR. EDITOR: I wish, as an illiterate man of letters, to express the sense of satisfaction that I owe to Prof. Max Müller for his admirable paper on "Buddhist Charity," in the March number of the REVIEW. In common with many unscholarly writers, I have long been familiar with the publications of this accomplished Orientalist, whom we all know through the lyrics of his poet-father, one of the latest of the master-singers, and I desire to thank him for the flotsam and jetsam that he has cast up along our bleak New England shores, treasuretrove from the peaks of the Himalayas, the Sacred River, and the many-islanded Ho-ang-ho. The work that he has been instrumental in accomplishing, through his translations from the Sanskrit and other old-world languages, is not to be measured by the younger generation of Puritans. I am old enough to remember the day when it was proclaimed of a noted infidel, Abner Kneeland, that his tongue ought to be torn out by the roots. This was in Boston, early in the third decade of this Christian century. The charity of Boston was not the charity of Buddhism in the days of King Asoka, of Judaism in the days of Jesus of Nazareth, of Christianity in the days of St. Martin of Tours, or in the days of that holy woman, St. Elizabeth of Hungary, whose life and suffering was the noblest inspiration of the Rector of Eversley in his young manhood. It was not, and is not, the boundless charity of the World's Poet, who discovered the soul of goodness in things evil, and observingly distilled it out. It is not even the charity of Burns and Byron, reprobates both; still less is it the charity of Hawthorne and Mrs. Stowe. I am in a hot-bed of revivalism at this present writing, and the shadows of Moody and Sankey darken the pages on which I scrawl these words. It was only last night that three children—for they were little more—entered this chamber, and said that an orphan girl, not seventeen, was walking up and down the windy, frosty road, out of her mind, with a Bible in her hand, crazed with religion. I have not heard what became of her, but I suppose she spent the night in that *maison de santé*, the

poor-house. Better than alms like this, the moldy scraps in "The Three Baskets." Better still the charity of St. Paul, if it was St. Paul who wrote, "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal."

R. H. STODDARD.

MR. EDITOR: Mr. Halstead, in the March number of the REVIEW, delivered a rattling fusillade all along the political lines. It contained, however, more noise and smoke than lead; for, whatever else we may say, one cannot consider the article heavy. His thesis, "The Revival of Sectionalism," aimed to prove the identity of Republican defeat with the rehabilitation of a narrow, local, and selfish policy; that Democratic victory means national disaster, etc. We all know the familiar wail of the vanquished politician, "My party is beaten, and the country will go to the dogs." We cannot congratulate the author on the novelty of his war-cry. Disrobed of its brilliant paradoxes and stripped to the skin, the plea becomes substantially this: The late slave-holding States sought unsuccessfully to shatter the Union; they were treated with unparalleled generosity because no one was hanged, drawn, and quartered; their full constitutional rights were restored after a period of probation, with additional representation, answering to the increased vote gained by the suffrage of the colored race; ergo, the Democratic party, which represents the most intelligent and competent classes of the South, was guilty of a monstrous crime, because, in carrying these States, it carried such increased representation as to put the power of the Government in its hands, when it secured the Presidential victory. This is the most curious *non sequitur* in the history of logic. The activity of party life is the very root of healthy government. A party that does not fight to win shows that feebleness of conviction which deserves defeat. Yet, as hard as the Democratic party fought for success, it achieved victory not so much by its own strength as by the weakness of its opponent. After twenty-four years of triumph, a great party had gradually succumbed to a dry rot. Many of its enthusiastic adherents had, from time to time, left its ranks, and at last a sufficient body had gone over to the enemy to carry the weight of victory with them. These seceders represented the best element of Republicanism, *i. e.*, that least tainted with jobbery and political corruption. Yet Mr. Halstead, who, like Danton, believes thoroughly in audacity, cries aloud in trumpet tones that the clock of time has been set back, and pours forth a series of woful jeremiads. Let the dashing Cincinnati editor cheer up. He may still have another chance for a somersault, and four years hence may be applying the lash, as he did once before, to the very men whom he now applauds to the echo.

G. T. FERRIS.

MR. EDITOR: The article on Titles, contributed to the REVIEW by President Gilman, is very suggestive. In fact, I am inclined to think it is too suggestive, since it suggests the question, Why not abolish all titles? President Gilman wants a reformation in the bestowal of academic titles, so that they shall mean something and be given only to those who deserve them. If we are to be thus exacting with the scholars, why not be equally

strict with the politicians? If a man has once held a seat in Congress, he forever wears the prefix "Hon." But to give this any real value, there should be discrimination. We should know whether he was elected unanimously, or by the skin of his teeth; whether he was reelected, or was told at the end of one term that his constituents had had enough of him; whether indeed he was elected at all, or was a contestant voted into a seat because his party in the House needed him. If we could have an impartial committee to give every Congressman a diploma certifying as to these facts, his "Hon." might be good for something. I think the fallacy in Dr. Gilman's discussion of academic titles lies in the assumption that it is possible to label men like merchandise. Being president of a university, he should know, as every graduate knows, that a dozen or twenty boys may be put through the same course of study, recite equally well, and receive the same marks, so that any faculty would be compelled to give them all the same diploma; yet their capacities for assimilating what they have learned, for growing by what they feed on, will be widely various. If a young man is to become a teacher, a certificate that he has passed honorably through certain courses of study has its value; but in any other calling, even under the best circumstances, it signifies exceedingly little. Only so much of his learning avails him as shows itself in the man, without unrolling the parchment. The person that writes A. B. or A. M. after his own name, is generally under the necessity of thus telling us what we should not otherwise have suspected.

LOUIS LEEMAN.

MR. EDITOR: I have read with interest Prof. Davis's able paper on the "Moral Aspects of Vivisection"; but the whole subject that he discusses is, I think, far broader than any question of ordinary morality. It concerns, indeed, the whole theory of the moral government of the universe, and whether on the theological or the utilitarian side, it can be settled by an appeal to the evidence of Nature. If, as I believe, it can be shown that the scheme of Nature is one totally indifferent to mere pain,—in other words, that torture for beneficent ends is resorted to at any and every stage of natural development,—it is surely clear that the advocates of vivisection need no apology. All life, indeed, is based upon the law of suffering. The dream of Science is to reduce that suffering to a minimum, and no one whose knowledge is adequate can doubt that men of science have achieved more good in this direction during the past two decades than sentimentalists have been able to do in a thousand years.

J. L. SMITH.

MR. EDITOR: I have read with no little interest the article on Endless Punishment, contributed by the Rev. Dr. Shedd to the February number of the REVIEW, and think it will do much good, by showing that there are some few philosophic spirits who still uphold, in these backsliding days, the central dogmas of the church, rooted in inspiration and founded in reason. Particularly interesting to me is his vindication of the Eternal Justice, which metes out punishment in that mathematical measure, apart from all considerations of human sentiment. Modern science, with all its perversions and

blasphemies, has done this great service to mankind : it has shown the Eternal Justice under the other form and name of righteous Law, exacting inexorably from every man and thing the penalty of wrong-doing, even to the utmost generation. No truth can be more evident to every thinking man than the truth of retribution, permanent in the physical and the moral world, and practically eternal, since no atonement, short of the highest, can divert it from its object ; and there are sins — murder, for example, or the shedding of blood—which even he cannot pardon, and the punishment of which, therefore, must be everlasting. True to the last syllable is the statement that “suffering that is penal can never come to an end, because guilt is the reason for its infliction, and guilt once incurred never ceases to be.” If the converse of this were true,—*i. e.*, that guilt is merely infirmity, and that punishment is merely educational,—the whole government of the moral universe would be indictable, wrong would in the long run be every whit as profitable as right (which, indeed, many transcendentalists would like to make us believe), and there would be no such thing as justice in the world. Fortunately, the Christian religion, while teaching the forgiveness of certain offenses, establishes the hopelessness and misery of sin that is absolute, of corruption that is irremediable. God is good because he is just, not because he is forgiving ; forgiveness being only tenable when forgiveness is just. To say that God pardons sin, and absolves it of its penalty, is to say that God fails to distinguish between good and evil—a hideous supposition. The divine law is fixed and adamant ; an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, saith the Lord. Living in a remote part of the country, and seeing little of the world, I have to gather much of my worldly knowledge from newspapers ; but what I read only corroborates my own small experience, that the world is full of sins that only Eternal Justice could adequately punish, sins not of ignorance and inexperience, but against the voice of conscience and the written and unwritten law. Such a sin, I conceive, is that conspiracy against social order which willfully destroys innocent lives by means of devilish modern inventions, such as dynamite. Surely no plea of justification could absolve the dynamiter from the eternal consequences of his own infernal deeds. But it is not for weak man to determine what sins are hopeless and utterly remote from the sweet rays of the divine mercy ; yet Dr. Shedd has shown that the whole scheme of Providence is inseparable from a philosophy that may be summed up in the words of Robert Browning :

“ Infinite Mercy, but, I wis,
As Infinite a Justice too ! ”

MARK ANDERSON.